Response to Restriction Requirement dated April 26, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the current Office Action, the Examiner has required that the Applicant elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

The Applicant notes that, upon allowance of a generic claim, the Examiner will consider

additional species that include the limitations of the generic claim as a matter of right.

dditional species that include the limitations of the generic claim as a matter of right.

The species identified by the Examiner are: 1) lantibiotics; 2) pharmaceutical carriers;

and 3) types of administration. Based on the Examiner's statement that the Applicant "elect a

single and specific composition with a single and specific lantibiotic compound, specific

pharmaceutical carrier(s) and specific mode of administration", the Applicant understands this

requirement to be to select one species from each group.

The Applicant hereby elects, with traverse: Duramycin, as a species of Lantibiotic; saline

solution, as a species of pharmaceutically acceptable carrier; and topical, as a species of mode of

administration. Claims 1-5 read on the elected species.

Applicants traverse the species election insofar as this restricts the claims of the

invention, as the Examiner has provided no reason that it would be an additional burden on the

office to search for different lantibiotic species, different pharmaceutically acceptable carriers or

different modes of administration. The Examiner has merely stated that these are not 'so linked

as to form a single inventive concept" and that these are not "art recognized equivalents". The

Examiner has cited to PCT Rule 13.2 and PCT Administrative Instructions, Annex B, part

1(f)(i)(B)(2). However, the Applicant notes that the 'general inventive concept' is that which is

claimed in the independent claim, i.e. a method of treating dry eye disease by administering a

therapeutically effective amount of a lantibiotic in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with this response. Should the

Examiner determine otherwise, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment of

fees to Deposit Account No. 11-0980.

Page 2 of 4

Appl. No. 10/488,276 Response to Restriction Requirement Dated April 26, 2007 Response dated August 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By: __/REBECCA J. KAUFMAN/____ Rebecca J. Kaufman Reg. No. 44,819

KING & SPALDING LLP 1180 Peachtree Street, N.E. 34th Floor Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3521 Telephone (404) 572-4600 Facsimile (404) 572-5134